REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 8 are in independent form, and have been amended hereby. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The title of the invention has been amended as requested in the Office Action on page 2. Withdrawal of the objection to the title is requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 11, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0136368 ("Wakayama"); and of the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over Wakayama in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,316 ("Albert").

Regarding the features of independent Claim 1 (or 8) "the first step (or means) sets in a first table a packet type, an error type, and a pattern extraction position within a received packet corresponding to those types, sets in a second table a retrieval pattern corresponding to the pattern extraction position," as examined, the Office Action argues that Wakayama shows at step 5020 in Fig. 10 a packet header being extracted and stored in a header buffer; in Fig. 8 the table containing stored header information; and in Figs. 12-13 the layout of fields that make up the Ethernet Header and the IP Header extracted and stored in the header buffer, specifically Frame Type (packet type) field 603.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Wakayama at best mentions "header information" and fails to teach or suggest "a packet type, an error type, and a pattern extraction position within a header of a received packet set in the first table;" and "a retrieval pattern corresponding to the pattern extraction position set in the second table," as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 8.

Further, regarding the features of independent Claim 1 (or 8) "the second step (or means) determines that the pattern has been retrieved when a pattern of the received packet is retrieved based on the pattern extraction position, and the retrieved pattern is matched with the retrieval pattern set in the second table," the Office Action argues that Wakayama shows at step 5230 in Fig. 11, the pattern of search key (Fig. 3) having been extracted from the packet header based on the pattern extraction position (IP header 610 in Fig. 13), and at step 5240 judging flow by matching the retrieved pattern with the retrieval pattern set in the second table (Fig. 3).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that while the SA and DA of Wakayama form a part of a header, they do not designate a pattern extraction position within a header of a received packet as in the presently claimed invention, but merely detect consistency/inconsistency with respect to the overall header with SA and DA being used as a retrieval key, therefore, Wakayama fails to teach or suggest a pattern extraction position within a header of a received packet as noted above, and does not require a second table for setting the retrieval pattern corresponding to the pattern extraction position, as in the presently claimed invention.

Albert fails to cure the deficiencies of Wakayama.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1 and 8, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over the Wakayama and Albert, alone or in any possible combination.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Pedro C. Fernandez/
Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6311
Fax: (212) 940-8986
Docket No.: FUJZ 22.365 (100794-01037)
PCF:fd